1	EDMUND G. BROWN JR.	
2	Attorney General of California MARC D. GREENBAUM	
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General SHAWN P. COOK	
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 117851	
5	300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013	
6	Telephone: (213) 897-9954 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804	
7	Attorneys for Complainant	
8	BEFORE THE	
	BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	STATE OF	CALIFORNIA
10	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 832-A
11	ROY PAYTON	50
12	6539 Firmament Ave. Van Nuys, CA 91406	ACCUSATION
13	Civil Engineer License No. C 38610	
14	Respondent.	
15		J = =
16	Complainant alleges:	
17	PAF	RTIES
18	1. David Brown (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity as	
19	the Executive Officer of the Board for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors, Department	
20	of Consumer Affairs.	
21	2. On or about September 5, 1984, the Board for Professional Engineers and Land	
22	Surveyors issued Civil Engineer License Number C 38610 to Roy Payton (Respondent). The	
23	Civil Engineer License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought	
24	herein and will expire on March 31, 2011, unless renewed.	
25	JURISDICTION	
26	3. This Accusation is brought before the Board for Professional Engineers and Land	
27	Surveyors (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws.	
28	All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.	

4. Section 6731 provides:

"Civil engineering embraces the following studies or activities in connection with fixed works for irrigation, drainage, waterpower, water supply, flood control, inland waterways, harbors, municipal improvements, railroads, highways, tunnels, airports and airways, purification of water, sewerage, refuse disposal, foundations, grading, framed and homogeneous structures, buildings, or bridges:

- (a) The economics of, the use and design of, materials of construction and the determination of their physical qualities.
 - (b) The supervision of the construction of engineering structures.
 - (c) The investigation of the laws, phenomena and forces of nature.
 - (d) Appraisals or valuations.
- (e) The preparation or submission of designs, plans and specifications and engineering reports.
 - (f) Coordination of the work of professional, technical, or special consultants.
- (g) Creation, preparation, or modification of electronic or computerized data in the performance of the activities described in subdivisions (a) through (f).

Civil engineering also includes city and regional planning insofar as any of the above features are concerned therein.

Civil engineers registered prior to January 1, 1982, shall be authorized to practice all land surveying as defined in Chapter 15 (commencing with Section 8700) of Division 3."

- 5. Section 6738, subdivisions (c), (a)(3) and (i), require in pertinent part that when fictitious names are used in the name of a civil engineering business, a current organization record form must be filed with the Board that identifies each of the licensees in the business.
 - 6. Section 6749 provides:
- "(a) A professional engineer shall use a written contract when contracting to provide professional engineering services to a client pursuant to this chapter. The written contract shall be executed by the professional engineer and the client, or his or her representative, prior to the professional engineer commencing work, unless the client knowingly states in writing that work

may be commenced before the contract is executed. The written contract shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following:

- (1) A description of the services to be provided to the client by the professional engineer.
- (2) A description of any basis of compensation applicable to the contract, and the method of payment agreed upon by the parties.
- (3) The name, address, and license or certificate number of the professional engineer, and the name and address of the client.
- (4) A description of the procedure that the professional engineer and the client will use to accommodate additional services.
 - (5) A description of the procedure to be used by any party to terminate the contract.
 - (b) This section shall not apply to any of the following:
- (1) Professional engineering services rendered by a professional engineer for which the client will not pay compensation.
- (2) A professional engineer who has a current or prior contractual relationship with the client to provide engineering services, and that client has paid the professional engineer all of the fees that are due under the contract.
- (3) If the client knowingly states in writing after full disclosure of this section that a contract which complies with the requirements of this section is not required.
- (4) Professional engineering services rendered by a professional engineer to any of the following:
 - (A) A professional engineer licensed or registered under this chapter.
 - (B) A land surveyor licensed under Chapter 15 (commencing with Section 8700).
 - (C) An architect licensed under Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 5500).
 - (D) A contractor licensed under Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 7000).
- (E) A geologist or a geophysicist licensed under Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 7800).

- (F) A manufacturing, mining, public utility, research and development, or other industrial corporation, if the services are provided in connection with or incidental to the products, systems, or services of that corporation or its affiliates.
 - (G) A public agency.
 - (c) "Written contract" as used in this section includes a contract that is in electronic form.
 - 7. Section 6775 of the Code states:

"The board may receive and investigate complaints against registered professional engineers, and make findings thereon.

By a majority vote, the board may reprove, suspend for a period not to exceed two years, or revoke the certificate of any professional engineer registered under this chapter:

- (c) Who has been found guilty by the board of negligence or incompetence in his or her practice.
 - (h) Who violates any provision of this chapter."
 - 8. Title 16, California Code of Regulations section 415 states:

"A professional engineer or land surveyor licensed under the Code shall practice and perform engineering or land surveying work only in the field or fields in which he/she is by education and/or experience fully competent and proficient.

Nothing in this regulation shall be construed: (1) to prohibit a professional engineer from signing plans which include engineering work in areas other than that in which he/she is fully competent and proficient, if such work was performed by other engineers who were fully competent and proficient in such work; (2) to prohibit a professional engineer from performing engineering work or a land surveyor from performing land surveying work in areas which involve the application of new principles, techniques, ideas or technology; (3) to prohibit a professional engineer from supervising other engineers or a land surveyor from supervising other land surveyors who may respectively be performing engineering work or land surveying work in areas other than those in which the supervising professional engineer or supervising land surveyor is fully competent and proficient; and (4) to prohibit a professional engineer from signing plans

which include engineering work, portions of which were designed or required by any governmental agency."

- 9. Title 16, California Code of Regulations section 463 states:
- "(a) A professional engineer who is associated as the partner, member, officer, or employee in responsible charge of professional engineering services offered or performed by a firm, partnership, or corporation shall notify the Board within thirty (30) days of such association or termination of association on a form approved by the Board.
- (b) A licensed land surveyor and/or civil engineer who practices or offers to practice land surveying, according to the provisions of Section 8729 of the Code, as a partner, member, or officer of a partnership, firm, or corporation shall advise the Board within thirty (30) days of such association or termination of association on a form approved by the Board.
- (c) A licensed photogrammetric surveyor who is associated as a member, partner, officer, or employee in a firm, partnership, or corporation which offers or performs photogrammetric surveying services according to the provisions of Article 5.5 of the Professional Land Surveyors' Act shall notify the Board within thirty (30) days of such association or termination of association on a form approved by the Board.
- (d) A firm which contains partners, members or officers as described above will be allowed six months following the death, disassociation, or retirement of a member, partner, or officer whose name the firm, partnership or corporation carried in its firm title to make a written request to the Board for an investigation pursuant to the requirements of Section 6738(e) of the Code. The Board will determine if such firm is eligible to continue use of its firm title without change."
 - 10. California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 404, subd. (n), states:
- "For the sole purpose of investigating complaints and making findings thereon under Sections 6775 and 8780 of the Code, "incompetence" as used in Sections 6775 and 8780 of the Code is defined as the lack of knowledge or ability in discharging professional obligations as a professional engineer or land surveyor."
 - 11. California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 404, subd.(w), states: "For the sole purpose of investigating complaints and making findings thereon under

Sections 6775 and 8780 of the Code, "negligence" as used in Sections 6775 and 8780 of the Code is defined as the failure of a licensee, in the practice of professional engineering or land surveying, to use the care ordinarily exercised in like cases by duly licensed professional engineers and land surveyors in good standing."

- 12. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the board may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.
 - 13. Section 118 of the Code states:
- "(a) The withdrawal of an application for a license after it has been filed with a board in the department shall not, unless the board has consented in writing to such withdrawal, deprive the board of its authority to institute or continue a proceeding against the applicant for the denial of the license upon any ground provided by law or to enter an order denying the license upon any such ground.
- "(b) The suspension, expiration, or forfeiture by operation of law of a license issued by a board in the department, or its suspension, forfeiture, or cancellation by order of the board or by order of a court of law, or its surrender without the written consent of the board, shall not, during any period in which it may be renewed, restored, reissued, or reinstated, deprive the board of its authority to institute or continue a disciplinary proceeding against the licensee upon any ground provided by law or to enter an order suspending or revoking the license or otherwise taking disciplinary action against the licensee on any such ground.
- "(c) As used in this section, 'board' includes an individual who is authorized by any provision of this code to issue, suspend, or revoke a license, and 'license' includes 'certificate,' 'registration,' and 'permit.'"

COST RECOVERY

14. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of

the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

PROJECT 1:

2875 Devonport Rd., San Marino, CA 91108

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Negligence)

- 15. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 6775 (c) of the Code and California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 404, in that he failed to use the care ordinarily exercised in like cases by a duly licensed professional engineer in the practice of engineering. The circumstances are as follows:
- 16. In or about the first half of 2004, Respondent and Ricardo Urquidi of K-Consultants prepared design documents to obtain a building permit for the construction of a second story addition of approximately 522 square feet to an existing 2446 square foot house located at 2875 Devonport Rd., San Marino, CA 91108 owned by Tomas Gutteres (the "project").
- 17. K Consultants submitted a thirteen sheet set of structural drawings and a thirteen page set of structural calculations (collectively, the "design documents" or "plans") for the project to the permitting authority, the City of San Marino ("City").
- 18. VCA Code Group ("VCA"), the City's plan check consultant reviewed the documents submitted by K Consultants. Respondent signed and sealed the structural calculations on two sheets as the Engineer of Record ("EOR").
- 19. VCA recommended approval of the plans and permit issuance to the City. The City authorized Building Permit B00-084-828 (the "Permit") be issued for the project on or about August 8, 2004.
- 20. Following issuance of the Permit, Abe Contractors, (the "contractor") a general contractor hired by the project owner, raised issues regarding the structural design that Respondent participated in preparing and that he signed and sealed as EOR. The contractor engaged Antonio Luisoni ("Luisoni") a licensed structural engineer, to review the approved drawings and calculations.

- 21. Luisoni stated that he found "major mistakes" in the structural drawings and calculations certified by Respondent. Luisoni submitted a new or revised set of plans to the City and based thereon the City issued a new permit.
- 22. During the time of the allegations herein, Respondent provided engineering services under the namestyle K Consultants and Ricardo Urquidi; 2321 W. Olive Ave., Suite L; Burbank CA 91506. In Respondent's filed organizational record with the Board, he represented that he solicits engineering services under the namestyle "Payton Engineering" at 22543 Ventura Bl. Suite 227, Woodland Hills, CA 91364.
- 23. Respondent's proposed loading of two 25.5 foot spanning 6" x 14" hip beams onto a 23 foot span 6" x 12" beam raises structural review questions and concerns. The analysis method and approach used by Respondent to specify Beam in his structural calculations is below the standard of care and does not demonstrate a rational and logical structural approach.
- 24. Respondent's structural drawings for the lateral loading of the project's second story addition where he elected to perform and submit an analysis to the permitting review authority is difficult to follow, overly simplistic, inconsistent and incomplete and falls below the standard of care that it be rational, clear and complete.
- 25. The structural analysis submitted by Respondent fails to reflect the complex nature of and design of the roof system for the project addition. Respondent's failure to reflect the geometric design and material selections in his structural analysis as depicted in his drawings is below the standard of care.
- 26. The analysis submitted by Respondent with respect to soil resistance bearings does not reflect a rational method of applying loads and providing for their resistances and is below the standard of care.
- 27. Respondent's structural submittal for the project is below the standard of care. Respondent's design is not "conventional light framed wood construction", and therefore, while he would have flexibility in structural geometry, material choices and force applications, the standard of care would require that the analysis conform to normal, rational methods, where standard details are replaced by custom details, standard tables are replaced by engineered

calculation, and standard wood framing is replaced by specific member design, with submittals to the City being correct and based upon a comprehensive and professional review. Respondent's submittals fall below that standard of care.

28. Respondent's engineering analysis and submitted calculations encompass non-standard practices, quality assurance oversights, illogical load analysis and incorrect or inaccurate methodology. Respondent misapplied formulization factors and failed to thoroughly review his analysis for correctness and logical conformity with scientific principles and engineering methods. Respondent's plans submitted to the City are below the standard of care for practice of professional engineering within the construction industry.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to Enter into Written Contract)

28. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 6749 of the Code in that he failed to utilize a written contract, meeting the requirements of the section, prior to providing engineering services to his client.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to File Organizational Records)

29. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 6738 subdivisions (c), (a)(3) and (i) (c) of the Code and section 6775, subd. (h), for violation of California Code of Regulations, Title 16, California Code of Regulations section 463, in that he failed to file the proper organizational records and to inform the Board of his association or employment by K Consultants.

PROJECT 2:

25066 Mulholland Dr.; Calabasas, CA 91302

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Negligence)

30. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 6775 (c) of the Code and California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 404, in that he failed to use the care

ordinarily exercised in like cases by a duly licensed professional engineer in the practice of engineering. The circumstances are as follows:

- 31. In or about 1993, Respondent provided engineering services to Edward Betz (the "owner") for a project located at 25066 Mulholland Dr.; Calabasas, CA 91302 (the "project"). Respondent prepared an "as built grading plan" that was submitted to the County of Los Angeles Building and Safety Dept. ("L.A. County") and to the California Coastal Commission ("Coastal Commission").
- 32. L.A. County approved an "as built grading plan" on or about November 17, 1993. Coastal Commission staff; however, recommended denial of a grading plan in or about June, 2004. The denied grading plan is an "after the fact" plan expanding grading volumes for the building pad from 3500 cubic yards of cut to 6250 cubic yards of cut and 6246 cubic yards of fill. These quantities match the quantities on Respondent's "as built grading plan".
- 33. Complainant is informed and believes and alleges that the denial of the grading plan by the Coastal Commission restricted the owner from timely proceeding with grading of the project. Further, it would most likely require extensive modifications to the grading plan to obtain Coastal Commission approval and the owner might be assessed penalties for completing grading work without having secured approval.
- 34. Respondent and the owner had a verbal agreement for Respondent to obtain and provide the owner with approvals from the necessary regulatory agencies for a grading plan for the project as the Engineer of Record for the project with L.A. County and the Coastal Commission.
- 35. Respondent affirmed with L.A. County that either he and/or "De Filippo-Payton" were consultants for the project and affirmed that the project grading was done in conformance with approved plans.
- 36. Respondent was required to observe, notify and report on the status and acceptability of the project grading. The project grading did not conform to the original plans. "As built" plans were required, which Respondent prepared for L.A. County approval and permitting. The

Coastal Commission is also an entity from which approval and permitting is required; however it was excluded from Respondent's "as built" plan process.

37. Respondent knew or should have known that he was required to obtain Coastal Commission approvals for the grading project. Respondent's failure to obtain approval from the Coastal Commission for his over-site work in the "as built" plan process constitutes professional conduct below the standard of care for a licensed professional engineer

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Failure to File Organizational Records)

- 38. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 6738 subdivisions (c), (a)(3) and (i) (c) of the Code and section 6775, subd. (h), for violation of California Code of Regulations, Title 16, California Code of Regulations section 463, based on the following circumstances:
- 39. Respondent used the name "Payton Engineering Company" on his submitted "as built" grading plan and also used said name on his business card. Respondent failed to submit organizational records for this fictitious business name to the Board.
- 40. Respondent on forms he executed to L.A. County in conjunction with his undertaking to over-see and obtain approval for the "as built" grading plan process, represented an association as "De Filippo-Payton". Respondent failed to submit organizational records for this fictitious business name to the Board.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Board for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors issue a decision:

- 1. Revoking or suspending Civil Engineer License Number C 38610, issued to Roy Payton Roy Payton.
- 2. Ordering Roy Payton to pay the Board for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3;

Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 3. 8/25/09 Original Signed DATED: Executive Officer Board for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Department of Consumer Affairs State of California Complainant LA2008602085 accusation.rtf

Accusation